



STATEWIDE TRAINING AND EDUCATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES

January 17, 2014 – Sacramento, California

Members Present:

Robert Briare, California Professional Firefighters
Taral Brideau, California Fire Fighter Joint Apprenticeship Committee (alternate)
Randy Collins, California Fire Technology Directors Association (North) (alternate)
Bret Davidson, So Cal Training Officers Association (alternate)
Natalie Hannum, California Fire Technology Directors Association (North)
Lorenzo Gigliotti, California Emergency Management Agency (alternate)
Chris Jelinek, Nor Cal Training Officers
Mary Jennings, California Fire Fighter Joint Apprenticeship Committee
Kenneth Kehmna, Fire District Association of California
Ron Myers, League of California Cities
Corey Rose, Metro Chiefs
Daniel Stefano, California State Firefighters' Association
Ken Wagner, California Fire Chiefs Association
Kim Zagaris, California Emergency Management Agency
Sam Hoffman, California State Firefighters Association (alternate)

Members Absent:

Dennis Childress, So Cal Training Officers Association
Ron Coleman, STEAC Chair
Kay Price, CAL FIRE Academy
Steve Shull, California Fire Technology Directors Association (South) (alternate)
Jim Skinner, League of California Cities (alternate)
Rich Thomas, California Professional Firefighters (alternate)
Nathan Trauernicht, California Fire Chiefs Association
Tom Turner, California Fire Technology Directors Association (South)
John Wagner, Nor Cal Training Officers Association

State Fire Training Staff:

Kevin Brame, Fire Service Training Specialist III
Kevin Conant, Fire Service Training Specialist III
Jim Eastman, Fire Service Training Specialist III
Mike Garcia, Deputy State Fire Marshal III Specialist
Ron Martin, Fire Service Training Specialist III
Mike Richwine, Assistant State Fire Marshal and SFT Division Chief
Mark Romer, Fire Service Training Specialist III
Kris Rose, Staff Services Manager I
Rodney Slaughter, Deputy State Fire Marshal III Specialist
William Vandevort, Fire Service Training Specialist III

Guests:

David Andrews, Los Angeles County Fire Department
Ray Bizal, National Fire Protection Association
Jonathan Black, Santa Clara County Fire Department
Rodney Daniels, Waldorf College
Ken Davis, CAL Fire Training Division
Kent Freeman, Roseville Fire Department (ret.)
Tony Hargett, Sacramento Metropolitan Fire Protection District
Duane Hoerth, California Emergency Dispatchers Association
Stan Klopfenstein, Santa Clara Fire Department (ret.)
Tony Meacham, CAL FIRE Training Division
Leslie Muller, California Emergency Dispatchers Association
George Morris, CAL FIRE Academy
Brendan O'Leary, City College of San Francisco
Mike Ramirez, CAL FIRE Academy
Allison Shaw, California State University at Sacramento
Heather Williams, California State University at Sacramento

I. Introductions and Welcome

Meeting called to order at 9:00 AM by Ken Wagner, the STEAC vice chairman. K. Wagner acted as the chair of this meeting in the absence of Chief Coleman. When K. Wagner is presenting his agenda item, the committee chair will be turned over to Ron Myers until K. Wagner has finished his presentation. Introductions took place.

A. Roll Call/Quorum Established

A quorum was established during introductions. K Wagner mentioned the wireless connection password and user information for those who would need Wi-Fi access. K. Wagner also mentioned to park in the OES parking lot to avoid towing, and to turn in funds to Kris Rose for lunch.

K. Wagner proceeded to identify changes in the STEAC membership: Larry Savage is no longer an alternate member representing Nor Cal Training Officers, John Wagner has now been appointed to alternate with Chris Jelinek taking over as member. Roxanne Bercik of Metro Chiefs has retired and is no longer participating in STEAC. Corey Rose from the Los Angeles City Fire Department has taken her place as the member representing Metro Chiefs. For the purpose of today's meeting, Randy Collins will vote on behalf of California Fire Technology Directors Association (CFTDA) for the south, as there are no CFTDA south members present. During the lunch break, the video presentation of Dr. Oneil will take place.

II. Agenda Review

Ken Wagner asked members for changes to the agenda or if any members needed to leave the meeting early. There were no changes or members having to leave early.

III. Approval of the October 18, 2013 Minutes

Motion: *Robert Briare made a motion to accept the minutes from the October 18, 2013 meeting, and Kim Zagaris seconded the motion.*

Action: *All members voted unanimously.*

IV. State Board of Fire Services (SBFS) Update

Chief Richwine provided information from the last meeting. The group spent a considerable amount of time discussing the new curriculum going to the SBFS for approval. State Board of Fire Services (SBFS) approved the Fire Fighter I (FF I) curriculum for the beta test process that will be conducted at Sierra College. The CICCIS qualification guide was also approved by SBFS. SBFS is aware that there will be many curriculum packages coming in the following months. Chief Richwine asked members that any issues related to the new curriculum be worked out at the STEAC meetings before moving to SBFS for approval.

V. Mission Alignment

A. Achieving National Recognition

1. Waldorf College – State Fire Training Course Articulation

**Presenter: Rodney Daniels – Waldorf College
(Attachment 1)**

Rodney Daniels, the educational representative from Waldorf College, discussed the programs that are being offered. The school has been established since 1903, with a campus in Iowa, and is a regionally accredited college under the North Central Association of Colleges. The information in the packet includes degree and certificate programs, fees, and classes offered. Tuition is comparable to other online schools. There are no fees to transfer in credit, view professional certificates, or turn in an application. Many of the students are from California, and the degree programs accept a wide variety of professional certificates and are also able to accept some classes for credit. Some of the professional certificates are not applied to the main course of study, but are accepted as electives.

The fire service program is limited, Waldorf College has a BS degree program that accepts transfer credits of up to 90 hours, and for the Associate degree, they can accept up to 45 hours of transfer credit and also accepts military experience. The school also offers 4 scholarships per year that are good for 60 hours of credit.

Scholarships are offered only to family members of military and fire service employees. A 200-300 word essay is required for the scholarship packet. R. Daniels has asked the members and guests to distribute the flyer about the scholarship program. Applicants do not have to be a student of Waldorf College to qualify for the scholarships. Contact information for R. Daniels is included in the packet. The floor was opened for questions. Rodney Slaughter asked how far along R. Daniels is with looking at the SFT classes and

bringing those classes into their system. R. Daniels responded that he has been working on the course information and the class content that is over 40 hours is being taken under consideration. Information has been given to the matriculation personnel for review. Natalie Hannum asked if there is a way to consider the classes that are being offered to a private provider, because a transcript will not be generated and the SFT classes will not appear. How do you accommodate students who have the SFT certificates? R. Daniels responded that the student would need the certificate and the registrar would review the course on whether the course is equivalent to a course within the Waldorf program. For a private company, the registrar would ask the provider for a course description. N. Hannum also asked about the theological component, since Waldorf is a Christian based-college. R. Daniels replied that there is a class offered in regards to world religions (overview of about 35 different religions dating back to Buddhism), but it is required for the online program for bachelor and associate degree programs. Sam Hoffman asked if satellite classes will be offered in California. R. Daniels responded that there are no plans to establish satellite locations at this time, but the fire service program is 100% online. Randy Collins asked if there would be an associate in fire science created. R. Daniels responded that there is an associate of arts degree, with a focus on fire science. The unit fees are at a full credit (\$275 an hour). Students can use a learning partner, where the department can receive a 10% discount. If organizations do pay upfront, federal options are available. Payments can also be made in 3 increments using a credit card. R. Daniels will be present during the lunch session to answer additional questions.

2. Fire Fighter I Certification Testing

**Presenter: Ken Wagner
(Attachment 2)**

Ron Myers assumed the responsibilities of acting as the STEAC chairman. Ken Wagner presented information on how the certification testing process for Fire Fighter I (FF I) may look. He also shared current information that has been gathered, and answered additional questions about the content.

K. Wagner stated that the STEAC members should continue to discuss certification testing at the STEAC level, so when presented to State Board of Fire Services (SBFS) in the future, everyone will be on board. K. Wagner shared the points on why we are discussing this issue, how it will work, what it will cost, and how we plan to move forward. R. Myers asked all members and guests who may have questions to write them down and hold until the end of K. Wagner's presentation.

K. Wagner discussed that in Blueprint 2020, a strong emphasis was placed on enhancing the professionalism of our programs by implementing capstone testing, and bringing our certification system in line with other certification/licensing programs. K. Wagner made reference to a handout that identified various licensing programs in California, and that there were over 40 careers and professions that require licensure and have some sort of testing (written, oral, or both). Curriculum cadres have been moving forward with the creation of the capstone task book process, and when completed the structure of requiring a capstone task book and certification testing would be consistent with national certification and mirrors what other states are doing with certification systems. K. Wagner performed an analysis on what other states are

doing, and identified that California, Illinois, Michigan, and South Dakota do not have a certification testing process in place for FF I. Hawaii has some documentation, but he is not sure how they fit in with the other states. More research will need to be conducted. The other states have processes in place in regards to certification testing, at least in regards to FF I.

K. Wagner then discussed that State Fire Training (SFT) has strong relationships with over 36 colleges known as Accredited Regional Training Programs (ARTP). In addition, there are also 8 fire departments designated as Accredited Local Academies (ALA). This structure provides a platform where we can launch and administer the certification examination process. The certification examination process can be adapted to fit the needs of fire agencies and individual candidates. Several ARTP's will be established as examination centers in order to offer access to examinations for individuals and small groups. Skills examinations will be delivered using standardized skill sheets, developed and published online on the SFT website, so all candidates and stakeholders have 24-hour access. Written examinations will be developed using a commercial database, and delivered in an online format using a 3rd party vendor, which provides a much higher level of security. SFT will develop a cadre of skills evaluators, who have been trained by SFT and will be an employee of the ALAs and ARTPs.

K. Wagner shared a document that shows the FF I certification examination track, and the specific flow process. The candidate would complete the academy process, and the ARTP or ALA would administer the skills and written examination to candidates before leaving the site. Then the task book is filled out and an application is submitted to SFT for certification. K. Wagner then explained the ARTP/ALA certification examination process for FF I in flowchart form. The process is currently being used for our current certification system. The ARTP or ALA would notify SFT for the test scheduling process, including dates of skill and written exams and who would be serving as Lead Evaluator and Skills Evaluator for the tests. K. Wagner then explained the complete process, section by section, identifying the responsibility of SFT in regards to this process. Once the testing has been conducted, the documents are sent back to SFT, who in turn will send out a form letter to each candidate informing them of their scores. This is in addition to the notification the on-line written exam vendor provides the candidate at the end of the written exam.

K. Wagner continued the presentation by adding that this process is how SFT envisions the steps and how it will work within the current SFT process. K. Wagner then discussed the delivery process, and explained in detail the analysis on the various costs associated with conducting the skills and written examinations. The analysis was developed along with the California Fire Technology Directors Association in order to get a direct view on the costs at their level and how the process would work within the community colleges. There will be projected ARTP costs across the state, but they will be varied due to the various relationships between the ARTPs and fire agencies. The gross costs reflect what an ARTP will incur when administering certification examinations. K. Wagner discussed the staff hours to manage the skills examination process, the cost per hour range, the total cost range, and the cost per candidate range. In regards to the amount a student would have to pay, or a department would pay on behalf of a student, SFT is proposing a \$10 per student examination registration fee collected by the ARTP from each student. SFT is a self-supporting program, and does

not receive general fund support. There is a need to have a fee mechanism in place to support the administration of the examination process. The fees collected by the ARTP for each student would be the student examination registration fee, the tuition fee, and the on-line exam fee. The fees reflect the maximum per student cost increase if ARTP cannot absorb certification examination costs into current academy costs.

If the community college has to increase hours in their academy in order to conduct the skills and written testing there would be 1 unit of time, 1 unit cost and the cost to the student will be an additional \$46. A total maximum cost increase for a student enrolled in a fire service program at an ARTP, total cost would be \$74 per student. If a student is not enrolled in a course, the ARTP would be looking to collect the full cost per student, including the student examination fee, and \$18 to the 3rd party vendor for the online written examination. The chart does not reflect the various relationships that fire departments may have with their local community college.

K. Wagner concluded the presentation by re-iterating the following process items: SFT will continue with program development to make sure all are knowledgeable on how the program will work; continue ongoing meetings with stakeholder groups and communicate the changes; continue the beta testing at Sierra College and deliver the evaluator training also at Sierra College; utilize on-line testing instruments with 3rd party vendor; process the beta test to check the skills testing and security features to ensure that the process will work. The plan is to bring more information forward at future STEAC meetings, with an action item asking STEAC and SBFS to approve the implementation of the examination process.

R. Myers opened the floor to the members and guests for comments/questions about K. Wagner's presentation. Bret Davidson asked about the flow chart and the written exam, and wanted to confirm that SFT will set up with an online vendor for testing. K. Wagner responded that the online vendor is providing the platform, but not an online center. A computer lab will be available at the ARTP for students with a proctor in a lab-setting. Chris Jelinek asked for a better understanding on becoming accredited as an ARTP or ALA; if the process to become certified is difficult, how may we obtain the ability to certify students. K. Wagner responded that we would look at those special circumstances and work with our partners, fire agencies, and the ARTP's to develop mechanisms to avoid failure, and to make sure that a proctor is involved with the testing process. C. Jelinek asked if this accreditation process is unique to California, or are we following IFSAC and Pro Board's guideline as done in other states. K. Wagner responded that all processes proposed would match with the accreditation process with IFSAC & Pro Board. Chief Richwine asked C. Jelinek about FF I process in his area. C. Jelinek responded that it has changed as of 2014 and was originally run by Regional Occupational Program (ROP) and was described as a volunteer academy where 50% of work was done through the academy, and the other 50% done through separate agencies. Within the country, there are separate training academies for the north, mid-central, and then a candidate goes off to separate agencies for certification. A county volunteer FF certificate is given from the academy, but does not reflect the state standards until completion of the task book, which is done in advance. Chief Richwine confirmed that it is a collaboration of the agencies and training officers that provide the academy. C. Jelinek responded that the instructors are provided by each agency and the worker compensation insurance is covered under the specific fire department. Randy

Collins asked if there is going to be a road show or outreach efforts to make sure that the community colleges get the right information (to promote continuity). K. Wagner responded that once the process is approved, SFT will go on the road and conduct training for the lead and skills evaluators, and that he and Mark Romer are working on that process. The reason for the beta test component is to make sure all processes work and once implemented, have IFSAC and Pro Board come out for the site visit and view at the beta test, and after approval go on the road to communicate the new process. Chief Richwine added that we are willing to meet with any group, but unless individuals are not reading the information about these processes on regular basis, it can be difficult to understand, so SFT is willing to get involved with the outreach process.

R. Collins mentioned that the chiefs in his area are looking to get the information out to the stakeholders, and he will work with that group to provide outreach. Natalie Hannum asked if there is a map to identify groups of individuals in pocket communities coming through that are not connected to an ALA or ARTP, and if so, the community colleges will work on outreach within those districts in regards to the FF I program. Chief Richwine mentioned that in some areas, especially the northern counties and the rural areas, there are no programs or there are limited programs with no access to the community colleges, and they are running volunteer academies to get basic skills. This meets the need for the local level but maybe not meet the state level; however, there is nothing that says that these groups have to use or support our system. The intent is to provide support and assistance to those groups for any level of training. N. Hannum agreed with the road show process, maybe using a consortium to ensure these groups have access to the information.

Dan Stefano asked about the re-test process and is it mapped out. K. Wagner responded that if the candidate fails the test on the day of the exam, can take a re-take the same day. If they fail the 2nd time, the student will need to petition SFT to get authorization to re-take the skills and written test, but on different days at the same ARTP or a different ARTP. Building on fairness and transparency, the candidate will also be able to come to SFT to view the written test, discuss the results, and identify how to prepare for the next exam. Corey Rose commented that it is advantageous to go regionally because it is less expensive for the candidates. K. Wagner stated that this information cannot support all the different scenarios, but if an individual person is not in the academy, the process can be more difficult. C. Rose asked how would this process work for our next group (Los Angeles City Fire Department) with skills training, having 70 people signed up for the next class. K. Wagner responded that the academy would do the testing and SFT will help set up the process. K. Wagner added that many more agencies will become accredited local academies and although this is not a driving interest of SFTs it would be a good outcome. Chief Richwine commented on C. Rose's concerns, and asked what SFT can consider. C. Rose stated the costs per class would be a large amount, and are expecting up to 170 candidates for 2014, and that the agencies will have to support the process.

K. Wagner responded that we would have to look at the cost for an ALA to identify the specific costs. C. Rose stated this cost is minimal, but process is a good idea, in regards to the cost, and will spread the word to stakeholders. Rodney Slaughter added that K. Wagner has done an excellent job with the figures, and added his support. Mark Romer mentioned that there was a cost savings of \$92 per student in the beta test that is

currently running that the unit value went down, and most agencies will find it occurring out in the field. R. Myers asked members if anyone has follow-up questions. B. Davidson stated that some agencies may have issues in becoming ALAs, but it will raise the professional standards in our state. K. Wagner asked members to contact him via e-mail if any other questions or concerns arise, so we can address them. We know many agencies may have some anxiety about becoming an ALA. Chief Richwine asked about the implementation plan for FFI. K. Wagner added the implementation plan for the examination is separate, but distinct. The self-imposed timeline is to have the process completed and in place by the end of 2014, but we cannot move forward until we receive STEAC and State Board of Fire Services (SBFS) approval. R. Myers added that all fire chiefs may not necessarily understand, and that it is important that we do the outreach and that this would be easier to fix now than a year from now. There are some pieces that will be analyzed as we continue to move forward. N. Hannum is recommending a small working group be created to work on talking points when dealing with the outreach. Chief Richwine supports that function, and stated that we will have a CAL FIRE Public Information Officer dedicated to creating a communication strategy, but would like STEAC to get involved with this process also. R. Myers suggested that the STEAC members go out to gather up interests, and to help constituents understand the complete process. Tony Meacham suggested that he and the members of the FF I and II development cadre can contact individuals and explain the testing process and answer questions.

At the end of K. Wagner's presentation, the STEAC chair was relinquished by R. Myers, and turned back over to K. Wagner.

3. Accreditation Status Report **Presenter: Rodney Slaughter** **(Attachment 3)**

Rodney Slaughter explained the upcoming site visits for February, and that Merritt College's review has been moved to the first week of February. R. Slaughter is asking for STEAC members to volunteer to work on the site visits. Bret Davidson volunteered to participate on the site visits at Victor Valley College on March 12, 2014 and Los Angeles Fire Department visit on March 18, 2014. Ken Kehmna will also participate in the Los Angeles Fire Department visit. R. Slaughter will also request that a fire technology director also be present. R. Slaughter received an application from El Camino College, and will provide an update at the next STEAC meeting. Travel expenses are reimbursable for any STEAC member who wishes to participate. K. Wagner mentioned that this is an obligation for all STEAC members therefore, everyone should step up and support this process, and to contact R. Slaughter to sign-up for participation.

B. Curriculum Development & Delivery

Ken Wagner asked Bill Vandevort to give an introductory review on the curriculum development process, and the 6 curriculum and 13 course plans, and after these comments, each cadre lead will follow and explain the specific curriculum more in detail. B. Vandevort made reference to the various packages that will be reviewed at this meeting. B. Vandevort mentioned that the documents are tied in to the NFPA standards with the only exception to

laws or mandates that are specific to California that the national standard cannot address. Documents are translated as job performance requirements (JPR), and terminal learning objectives (TLO). B. Vandevort explained that what is new are the enabling learning objectives (ELO), which reflect the required knowledge and skills that are stated in the NFPA. He expects the instructors will need to focus on the ELO's, and the lesson plans will revolve around those learning objectives. The entire system is being overhauled, even as the program continues to work. Also coming soon are the certification task books. As the standards are being created, there is a difference between training and certification, as we are not losing it, but "re-using it". B. Vandevort mentioned that if questions do arise regarding any of the curriculum presentations, to hold the questions until the end of each presentation. It is the hope of the cadre leads that the curriculum that is being presented today will be ready for approval at the February 28, 2014 STEAC meeting. K. Wagner asked the members if they had any questions, the members did not have any questions.

1. Discussion: Firefighter II Curriculum

**Presenter: Mark Romer
(Attachment 4)**

Ken Wagner stated that this action item requires a motion for approval, and once the motion is carried, this item will move on to the State Board of Fire Services (SBFS) for final approval. Mark Romer added that the request to add the standards for Confined Space Rescue Awareness (CSRA) and ICS Training has been added to the certification training standards (CTS) for Firefighter I.

Today's presentation is the 2nd reading for Fire Fighter II (FF II), and M. Romer had not received any questions/concerns from the constituency groups about the curriculum prior to this meeting. He mentioned an update in regards to the specific breakdown for hours per student. M. Romer asked for questions from members; there were none. M. Romer then asked the members for a motion to vote on the curriculum. K. Wagner then asked members for additional questions, to which there were none. K. Wagner entertained a motion to accept the Fire Fighter II curriculum.

Motion: Bret Davidson made a motion to accept the Fire Fighter II curriculum, and Dan Stefano seconded.

Action: All members voted unanimously.

K. Wagner then asked members for comments/questions. Bret Davidson mentioned that the curriculum is more in line with what is needed in the future and said it was very well done. No questions from the members or guests. M. Romer provided a "thank you" for the hard work done by Jonathan Black, Tony Meacham, Allison Shaw from Sacramento State, and other members of the cadre. Applause was given to M. Romer and his cadre.

2. Plan Examiner Standards and Curriculum

**Presenter: Mark Romer
(Attachment 5)**

Mark presented an update on the curriculum, and mentioned Allison Shaw from California State University Sacramento, who is the editor working to re-format the curriculum. Originally, the old curriculum included level 3 training within the fire prevention certification track, a 40-hour class on hydraulic sprinkler calculations, and a 40-hour class on plan checking. The NFPA has different professional qualifications established in that process. The new changes to the curriculum now include the Inspector track with 3 course levels, then Plans Examiner, then Fire Marshal (which is its own standard). M. Romer then mentioned the class hours of 36, 24, and 42, which totals to 92 hours of instruction based on NFPA 1031 under the Plan Examiner. It is a culmination of two programs put together in the three course plans, and individuals going through the training will complete both, which will show on the certificate.

Ken Wagner asked members for questions. Mary Jennings asked is this part of the eventual fire marshal certification. M. Romer's response was "no", as the fire marshal certification stands alone, and added that a student does not have to complete Plans Examiner to go on to the Fire Marshal certification. Randy Collins asked if the old 3A will replace the new 3A, and M. Romer responded that there is no correlation, but also noted that there is a section on hydraulics but has been reduced significantly based on the fact that the calculations are being done by computer. If there is a need to have a hands-on hydraulics class, we can take the curriculum and reformat, and add as an FSTEP class, instead of within the certification.

K. Wagner pointed out to the members that the staff report mentions information in addressing the instructor qualifications, but the implementation plans will be discussed at the 2nd reading and that at this time they are be worked on at a staff level. Chief Richwine asked why the old numbers for Plans Examiner 1A, 1B, and 1C are not being used, if it's a stand-alone certification. Bill Vandevort responded that these title changes will be updated to reflect 1A, 1B, et al. Chief Richwine asked Kris Rose if these documents have been e-mailed to Chief Tonya Hoover and to the Fire Prevention Officers for their input, and K. Rose responded "yes".

Chief Richwine stated that as a courtesy we should forward copies to the board members for their input, prior to February 28 STEAC meeting. Dan Stefano asked about the grandfathering process for the existing courses, and M. Romer responded that a timeline has not been established for when those classes will retire; the implementation timeline will be discussed at the next STEAC meeting. K. Wagner also added that we have many considerations with the community colleges and the timeframe for them to get the new material to their curriculum committees, but are looking at 2016 as to when the courses/certifications will be completed. K. Wagner also mentioned that with the new levels of certification we need to have a clear way for those people who are working in the existing certification track to continue and finish, along with the new track for candidates to get involved in. Natalie Hannum added that the SFT staff has done a great job with the timelines and the communication process. K. Wagner mentioned that when this item comes back at the next STEAC meeting, that the approval process be as smooth as FF II and do not hesitate to contact M. Romer or the other SFT leads with questions/concerns so we can try and address them before the next STEAC meeting. Corey Rose asked about the hours for the requisite knowledge and skills (page 36, section 6-13), which is about 80 hours. How do you describe that and where do those hours come from, as a portion of this comes from the S-290 class.

M. Romer described that it is not fully covered, stating that a student cannot predict fire behavior, is from a generic point of view. B. Vandevort did mention that S-190 is mentioned in another curriculum as a pre-requisite. Rodney Slaughter added that the Fire Marshal certification started with funding by a FEMA grant, and that covers some of the Wildland program information included in the Fire Marshal series.

Chief Richwine introduced Ray Bizal, the Southwest Regional Director of NFPA, and recognized him and the organization for Mr. Bizal's participation and help in getting these standards to STEAC. Mr. Bizal added that he plans to become more involved with the STEAC committee and become a conduit to get more interaction between NFPA and California. His goal is to get more Western influence in the financial standards, and STEAC can significantly impact these professional qualification standards. Applause was given to Mr. Bizal.

3. Discussion: Company Officer Standards and Curriculum

**Presenter: Bill Vandevort
(Attachment 6)**

Bill Vandevort's presentation began with reference to the staff report. Company Officer is replacing Fire Officer as recommended after a review of the Fire Officer certification track conducted in 2009 and subsequently approved by STEAC and the SBFS.

The proposed changes to the Company Officer training standards and the curriculum guidelines to meet those standards followed SFT's newly developed curriculum development guidelines. The new system utilizes a development and a validation cadre with an SFT staff as a cadre lead and an editor from Sacramento State University. Cadre members included participants from the north and south, career, volunteer and community colleges. B. Vandevort explained the process on how the cadre members reviewed and revised the documents.

The course plan figures in hours for instruction but does not include breaks, and lunch, the entity offering the class would determine those specifics. B. Vandevort explained the highlights: the name change; the CTS is based on NFPA 1021, levels I and II; NFPA 1052, and Wildland Fire Officer; IS-200.B; and Haz Mat Incident Commander per California Code of Regulations.

B. Vandevort then explained the course comparisons to the current Fire Officer Certification courses. There are 5 company officer courses, plus the Instructor I, as stated in the NFPA. All courses are 40 hours, and the administration class is 20 hours.

M. Jennings added that she cannot determine all that is required, that she cannot make a rational decision and vote. Ron Myers asked if there was a way to have this information on one page that tells the person exactly what to look for. Chief Richwine stated that few students go to the CTS; they go to the procedures manual to identify the requirements for the class. K. Wagner responded that level of certification is mentioned in the SFT procedures manual.

Corey Rose raised the question as to whether we should accept the online version of S-290 or only allow the classroom version. K. Wagner asked STEAC members for a

consensus on the online version or the use of the classroom version. A decision would need to be made before the next STEAC meeting. The online version is much easier and free, per Bret Davidson but is missing some components from the classroom version, like the practical applications and better quality comes from the full classroom version.

K. Wagner asked the members and guests for questions/comments. Mike Rodriguez commented on the S-290 class, and said that there is no comparison and that he is against the online class. Ken Kehmna added that we avoid accepting the online class, and that Fire Fighters should take the full class. K. Wagner added that he feels that there is consensus to forgo the online course and offer the classroom course. Kim Zagaris added that he agrees that 3 days in a classroom may be better than taking the course on line. K. Wagner ended B. Vandevort's presentation by mentioning that this item will be brought back at the February 28, 2014 STEAC meeting.

4. Chief Fire Officer Standards and Curriculum

**Presenter: Kevin Conant
(Attachment 7)**

Kevin Conant introduced his subject by saying that the information being provided is just as information only. We need to have a draft procedures page to allow members to see what is being done as a whole and will place this in the curriculum process. K. Conant spoke about the historical perspective, the cadre's role and participation, the development of the Certification Training Standards (CTS), and the course plan. There are certification tracks: Chief Fire Officer, Executive Chief Fire Office, and Fire Chief. The cadre group membership included representatives from the entire state with various levels of fire service backgrounds. The purpose was to develop the CTS, the course plan, and the task book. The main portion of the presentation covered the legacy curriculum and the new proposed courses, as there is good information that is taught in both management and command courses and we see them becoming modular training courses under FSTEP, rather than continuing as certification courses.

The proposed curriculum identifies four core classes from the NFPA standards, to ICS-300 for Chief Fire Officer, and ICS-400 for Executive Chief Officer. Fire Instructor II will also be included in this curriculum and be completed before the task book is issued. This model will allow us to have a "cafeteria plan" style of instruction that may identify a need for high-rise training for those metropolitan and suburban departments that offer direct response or through the use of a mutual aid agreements, and for the rural agencies that are not a part of a mutual agreement process and don't need or don't want to use the modular courses offered in FSTEP, they would no longer be required to complete said curriculum

Strictly following NFPA, led to the consolidation of 10 legacy courses down to 4 core courses, which is a dramatic difference due to the split of the Fire Officer curriculum into Chief Fire Officer and Executive Chief Officer. The template for the task book and the implementation plan will be presented in the future. K. Conant opened the floor for questions from members. Mary Jennings asked for clarification as to whether the item being reviewed today is for the Chief Fire Officer, not Executive Chief Officer. K. Conant responded by saying that the Executive Chief Officer is still in review, therefore the packet is for Chief Fire Officer. K. Conant's response was that NFPA does not call out

risk-specific events; if these are not called out in NFPA, will still keep as FSTEP courses. The elements of NFPA will be inclusive in the CTS. M. Romer added that there will not be a correlation from the old legacy courses over to the newer ones as they are dramatically different. Kevin Brame explained that the Executive Chief Officer Level IV does not exist in SFT as a certification, as it will be brand new. The courses currently in the management track do not take into the synthesis level, so we are bringing in new curriculum to address this noted deficit. The other five courses will remain for additional training, but will be significantly different. Ron Myers asked if the curriculum for Chief Fire Officer will be the same if transferred to a different part of the state and will the person need to have the same curriculum even if holding a Fire Officer certification. Natalie Hannum stated that a student could hone in on the skills he/she will be utilizing the most. K. Conant re-iterated that he applied the NFPA guidelines to the CTS, and there is value in knowing what the baseline is. M. Jennings asked if the FSTEP courses are required or considered for certification, and K. Wagner stated that we are relying on the NFPA standards. K. Conant stated that the cadre team looked at the NFPA standard to develop the CTS and Course Plans, and if additional training was desired by an agency or student, it would then be up to the individual to determine whether the additional classes were necessary beyond certification.

Kim Zagaris added that we are cutting down on classes and the staff's need to be baseline, but if stepping up to Chief Officer need to take on more knowledge, expertise and more responsibility and liability for the agency and community that we are asking him/her to provide service. B. Vandevort added that what is being done is providing the standards of training as a baseline, and we are not adding all the training that is required for the job and put into these programs. R. Myers stated he is not in agreement with B. Vandevort and doesn't see where it is beneficial. All we are focusing on is the certification. K. Conant added that for the cadre members it was difficult to let go of the concept of what was being certified in the past, and how to get out of a broken system rather than develop something that would address the NFPA standard. Corey Rose asked about when I-400 is offered. K. Conant mentioned it is at the Chief Executive Officer level. C. Rose stated that the individuals at the chief officer level need to have I-300 and I-400. If placed in a position and are not familiar with the content, the person will be lost. M. Romer states that federal law establishes that a person be at the battalion rank, or general staff operations level, but does not stop any organization from making the internal decisions on where staff needs to be within the organization. Those decisions need to be made to identify where you want our chief officer to be, because for certification purposes the individual needs to have completed ICS-300. R. Slaughter mentioned that once certification is earned, there will be a requirement for the Fire Fighter to continue education to maintain certification levels. Hiring agencies would ask what classes have been taken. N. Hannum added in regards to hire-rise training, we must standardize the smaller units, and then they can pull in individual components that would work for the specific service area, and not to make them so high that it becomes impractical to complete.

Kevin Brame added that we were looking to re-set, but cannot afford to have every Fire Fighter become Chief Fire Officer. We start with a foundation from which individuals choose their professional development track beyond the baseline for Chief Officer, making it clear for those to build their careers for the future. K. Conant added that was the former system when manageable, but is unsustainable and broken we need to

identify a baseline to identify the standards to use NFPA and developed the CTS. K. Wagner asked the members in regards to the discussion, at the staff level there is a need to address this item before bringing back to the next STEAC meeting, and the concept of the levels of ICS training that should be included and consideration of the comments mentioned associated with that. Ron Martin added the high-rise training and what good is it when it is not used. If the experience is not received behind the textbook knowledge, there is no skill set or KSAs (knowledge, skills, and abilities). What SFT is trying to provide is a foundation that is core. Students can customize specifics for their organization need to customize it and learn it, and need to look at what is needed to establish a foundation. R. Myers added that the members are here to question this information, not sure if our stakeholders will agree. K. Conant mentioned that if approved, staff will develop the message mapping, because the conversation will continue to come up until the legacy members are no longer in the system. Tony Meacham added that the instructors get in a bad position when you run out of material for the class setting, because there has to be a limit on duplication, is it quantity or quality of training for the end user. K. Wagner ended the presentation in that NFPA standards and the incident command training associated need to be addressed.

5. Fire Service Instructor I and II Standards and Curriculum

Presenter: Jim Eastman
(Attachment 8)

Jim Eastman discussed the Instructor I and Instructor II curriculum, and thanked the development and cadre members. He provided a quick curriculum overview of the program, to include alignment of the CFSTES and FSTEP classes with the national standards. He identified how the new curriculum creates a clear path to achieving national standards for SFT and how to reduce content duplication across courses. J. Eastman reviewed the current certification standard and the new standards and provided a comparison between the two, identifying that the old curriculum did not match up to the NFPA standards. The goal for the cadre members was to try and provide an avenue for the entry level Fire Fighter, Captain, et al, to get their coursework, time and experience, adding an opportunity for mastery, but the process cannot happen in the first and second year in the fire service. An outline highlighted the classes into a stair-step process to work towards educational mastery, and courses can be taken at any time. The FSTEP instructional curriculum involves e-learning, collaborative learning, digital learning, and full-spectrum learning and is already occurring in other states for excelling in the mastery of the delivery of education. The realignment of standards involves tying all into the NFPA. The plan is to recognize the national standards and accept more fire instructors from out of state. The avenue is that we provide future growth so that we don't over train and over qualify.

Ken Wagner asked the members for questions. Mary Jennings commented on the Fire Instructor certification training was the basis for Fire Fighter to become certified instructors in the educational area. If we go this path, it will not be used and anyone who needs a credential for funding for education will need to obtain training elsewhere. All the instructors must be licensed through California Commission for Teacher Credentialing (CCTC). K. Wagner asked if in regulation or statute or both, and M. Jennings responded that the authorization for the Fire Fighter program comes from the credentialing institution and in agreement, not in a regulatory provision. Chief

Richwine asked if the previous approval was based on the 80 hours and content for Instructor 1A, 1B, 1C. M. Jennings added that the approval process is based in number of hours and is not sufficient to meet the instructor standards for CCTC credentialing. CCTC requires specific numbers and does not meet the standards for teacher credentialing. J. Eastman added that once clarified, he can add to the curriculum. K. Wagner mentioned that SFT and CFFJAC are meeting to discuss dealing with the new curriculum and certification in order to meet the needs of CFFJAC. Sam Hoffman added that he went through the CCTC process, but his SFT instructor certificate was not accepted. Chris Jelinek asked about the process to be an instructor, but his State Fire Marshal certificates were not accepted and he had to repeat the courses at the university level. J. Eastman responded on what is needed for Instructor II, but will be discussed in the implementation plans (writing lesson plans, testing planning, test administration, and test design). Randy Collins asked whether a definition of what the credential instructor term is in the California Education Code might cause conflict. M. Romer answered that the Education Code is not referred to in Instructor II. Natalie Hannum also added the mandated funding is given by partnering with the K-12 programs, so the standards do not work, therefore turning away instructors. Ken Kehmna asked about the company officer as it relates to Instructor II. B. Vandevort responded by mentioning Instructor II for Chief Officer and Instructor I for Company Officer. M. Romer also added that Command 1A/1B for Instructor I, and Command 1C for Instructor II (in order to teach SFT classes). B. Vandevort added that in regards to lesson plans, that there are plans already developed and an emphasis to adapting for your own use. B. Vandevort asked M. Jennings in whether the training still meets the CFFJAC requirements. M. Jennings added that it has to do with an agreement made and the certification; they look at the SFM certification as opposed to course completion, and must be a certified Instructor I in order to get credentialed. M. Jennings added that whatever changes we make, must align with standards. Kim Zagaris added that we could possibly jeopardize CFFJAC funding if we use this curriculum. B. Vandevort stated if CFFJAC is reaching their students' needs through the SFT program, then there is revenue for SFT. C. Rose mentioned that we still have some issues to work out for these programs. K. Wagner mentioned that SFT is a partner with CFFJAC, we have to look at the implementation of the new program and identify clear and appropriate ways so that CFFJAC has something to take forward for their agreement. Chief Richwine added that we will continue to work with the CFFJAC and the cadre team.

6. Open Water Rescuer

**Presenter: Rodney Slaughter
(Attachment 9)**

Rodney Slaughter began his presentation, as this information was originally brought before STEAC at the October 18, 2013 meeting. State Fire Marshal received a letter from the USLA about acceptance of the training program that was originally presented. Taking into consideration comments from other fire agencies interested in this program, the course plan was updated to reflect the NFPA standards. R. Slaughter asked Tony Hargett from Sacramento Metropolitan Fire Protection District to provide additional comments.

T. Hargett commented that the section on the swimming standard will be left up to the individual agencies, but recommends that swimming 100 yards will become a minimum

standard per NFPA 1006. R. Slaughter re-iterated that it would be up to the agencies to determine what standards would be used based on the type of water rescues that take place. Ken Wagner asked for a vote to approve curriculum.

<i>Motion:</i>	<i>Natalie Hannum made a motion to accept the curriculum for Open Water Rescue and Robert Briare seconded.</i>
<i>Action:</i>	<i>All members voted unanimously.</i>

7. Trench Rescue Technician Training

Presenter: Rodney Slaughter
(Attachment 10)

Rodney Slaughter presented the subject matter, as information only. He passed around a trench rescue textbook that would be used in the training. The trench rescue cadre has been working on the project for 8 years. They have met with several soils engineers to help with the baseline standards in the textbook. Once approved the Trench Rescue Technician training program will be a 24-hour FSTEP class. Trench rescue site visits will be done by senior instructors. SFT will not go out and certify trench rescue training sites. R. Slaughter is requesting that the members review the information and be prepared to take action at the February 28, 2014 STEAC meeting.

Ken Wagner asked members for comments and questions. R. Slaughter asked Stan Klopfenstein, the cadre lead, and Kent Freeman from the cadre group to address questions. An engineer named Joe Turner from Santa Rosa, who is a soils engineer, has validated the shoring plans, and has been working with the team for the past few years. The data sheets are patterned after the data sheets in OSHA regulations, option #3. Also ran this process by another Patrick Bell, an OSHA engineering consultant in the Bay Area, who has put on his stamp of approval by stating that the systems developed are correct for trench rescue. Sam Hoffman asked if the class conforms with FEMA, and S. Klopfenstein answered that the class does conform with FEMA, and we have compliance with NFPA 1670 for trench rescue technician. Chris Jelinek asked about the textbook. S. Klopfenstein answered that we are looking to move through SFT to get the manual approved and the SFT authority to get the rollout classes started for current instructors. OSHA requires that all trench instructors are also “competent person” trained. The competent person training will be a part of the instructor roll out classes. R. Slaughter mentioned that the manual is a mock-up, has not gone to press. The document has been approved by Communications and is in the CAL Fire Director’s office awaiting signature. A price for the text book has not been established by the publishers as of yet. But the publisher does provide group discounts to Senior instructors. S. Klopfenstein mentioned that the entire package includes the manual and all SFT documents, but they want to move forward with the manual in order to send to print, and then afterwards will go to California Fire & Rescue Authority and start arranging the rollout sessions. The roll out would not be handled by SFT. K. Wagner stated that we do not have a quorum to vote on accepting the manual at this time, but ended the discussion by adding that there are no major concerns from the membership. The cadre team can move forward with getting the manual printed, with the knowledge

that an approval vote will not take place until the February 28, 2014 meeting which will include the course plan, implementation plan, and supporting documentation.

8. Hybrid Training Update

**Presenter: Rodney Slaughter
(Attachment 11)**

Rodney Slaughter began his presentation by mentioning that at the last STEAC meeting, a proposal was offered to put together a subcommittee from the STEAC membership in order to evaluate hybrid classes. Since that meeting, there have been no classes to review, but as of today's meeting there are some new training programs to review in terms of developing them into hybrid courses. The subcommittee is using a template from Allen Hancock College, and the California Fire Technology Directors Association (CFTDA) representatives nominated David Senior to chair this subcommittee. The subcommittee will need to start evaluating those courses in the context of delivering these classes in the future, and will need to start tracking and be ready for the approval process and hybrid delivery at the same time.

R. Slaughter spoke about a proposal from the Los Angeles Regional Training, which was sent to Chief Richwine for his review. The proposal is to have a mass delivery of the Instructor 1A and 1B classes to 30 different locations throughout the Los Angeles Basin. Chief Richwine will be responding to the proposal, but R. Slaughter asked the subcommittee to review the proposal and participate in the evaluation of the success of the mass delivery of those classes.

Ken Wagner asked for comments. Kim Zagaris has asked to be involved, and R. Slaughter will send the proposal out for review after Chief Richwine has approved. Corey Rose has some knowledge on how the system works, and is willing to provide any additional help. R. Slaughter added that this is a fundamental shift in how we do our business. K. Wagner added that the relationship between SFT, the Fire Fighter Safety program, and the IAFF program, and those departments in Southern California want to teach the RIC course, but will need to have a large number of registered instructors in place so the curriculum can move, this is part of their efforts.

R. Slaughter introduced Dave Andrews, representative for the Los Angeles Regional Training group, who created the proposal.

9. Fire & EMS Dispatcher Training Curricula (NFPA 1061)

**Presenter: Mike Richwine/Leslie Muller
(Attachment 12)**

Chief Richwine began the presentation by introducing Leslie Muller, Vice President of California Emergency Dispatchers Association, and Duane Hoerth, Northern Director of the California Emergency Dispatchers Association. Chief Richwine spoke about SFT providing support for curriculum and training for emergency dispatchers. L. Muller discussed the purpose of the presentation. The organization developed a new mission statement, and became the California Emergency Dispatchers Association 4 years ago. It is a member-driven association, has a non-profit status, and provides low cost or no cost training across the state.

L. Muller made reference to NFPA 1061, which was approved as the national standard in August, 2013. There are 7-9 different levels that that apply to this group. There is a training program that does exist, and was developed through the CAL Chiefs (by Leslie Wilson). The association compared the NFPA 1061 and the training curriculum, which matches, but wants this standard to be adopted for California Fire Dispatchers. There is curriculum that this group wants to present, but continues to work on that process. Accountability is critical, and firefighter safety is the other focus, but there is need to provide scenario-based training for current dispatchers. Dispatchers need a set standard that can be used for all dispatchers throughout the state. How the curriculum is going to be delivered is in the early stages, and this association is continuing to research in depth how to make the program work.

Chief Richwine thanked L. Muller for her presentation. Ken Wagner asked L. Muller for clarity in what the STEAC members need to know. She stated that she is asking for STEAC to support the concept of utilizing NFPA 1061 to develop professional standards for dispatchers in California, and to work with existing curriculum from CAL Chiefs and use it for supporting the levels of certification. K. Wagner asked all STEAC members for questions/comments. San Hoffman asked what format would be used for teaching dispatchers. L. Muller is working with the public safety director on programs at the junior college level to see what could be cost-effective, and if it's possible to offer college credit. She would like the program to run as "academy-based". Bret Davidson asked if there is enough staff at SFT to take current curriculum and turn into a FSTEP format and to credit different levels of training. Chief Richwine responded that we do not have enough staff, but wants to support the program through CAL Chiefs but is not sure if SFT is the right entity to get involved. If there is curriculum or programs out there that can be linked to SFT, we would be open to getting involved. There is a limit to what SFT can do, but want to hear from STEAC members, in the view of mission alignment, on some other ideas or suggestions to make this work.

Randy Collins mentioned a dispatcher academy and asked if there can be a potential to increase the fire component to align with Peace Officers Standards & Training (POST). L. Muller responded that D. Hoerth is working with the committee at POST, as they are also having budget cuts and staffing concerns. Kim Zagaris asked if there could be a dollar amount mentioned and what it would take to get the program developed; perhaps get federal funds, and have an opportunity to get into the community college. L. Muller responded that they can get individuals to volunteer to serve on the committee and are meeting with CSFA to create an ad hoc committee. Chief Richwine asked K. Zagaris if California Specialized Training Institute (CSTI) can get involved. K. Zagaris responded that he would have to ask for federal dollars, and is willing to work with SFT, but wants to use an off-the-shelf program. K. Zagaris continued that this process is more of a SFT workload and technology does not make this process easy. The concern is that the dispatchers are only having scenario-based training. Ron Myers feels that we should not bypass, but continue to find ways to make this work, having the dispatchers gain access to training is important. Dan Stefano supports the concept. Ken Kehmna and Corey Rose were also in acceptance and feels it is our responsibility to assist if possible. C. Rose suggested we check to see what other agencies are involved, and learn what processes are already being used to determine if some tasks can be done differently. Rodney Slaughter mentioned a state resource that

has funds for vocational education training, which is about 30 million dollars, and is not being used. R. Slaughter also mentioned to L. Muller to contact his office if interested. Kevin Conant commented on his belief in this program, as there are supporters within SFT. If grant funding is allowed, we should follow what our constituency directs us to do and use what is available. There is need for a higher level of professionalism. Bill Vandevort asked how many dispatchers would need the basic training. L. Muller responded there are at least 5,000 dispatchers at every level across the state. George Morris, representing the California Firefighters Academy, is looking at how to “marry” with POST curriculum, and has been in talks with law enforcement to make things happen. D. Hoerth responded although POST is geared for law enforcement, there is a way to add a law enforcement component into the fire classes that could possibly be certified and offered to the dispatcher training process and they are currently discussing that issue. G. Morris asked what he could do to put pressure on POST. L. Muller added that the organization has been working with CSTI to deliver a first responders operation class specifically for dispatchers and provided certification. There are some upcoming meetings with Roseanne McKinney, the POST consultant.

K. Wagner stated that this item is for information only, but recommend that a meeting take place with Chiefs George Morris, Mike Richwine, and Kim Zagaris and the representatives from the dispatchers association to identify how to get involved, and whether SFT should be involved and provide support. Chief Richwine asked if meeting with POST would also help, and D. Hoerth will speak with the POST representative to be involved, as we need to get arms around the issue and to also have law enforcement present. D. Hoerth talked about a new advisory committee. Mike Ramirez, representing CAL Fire Academy, asked about dealing with the EMS issues and is there any interaction about getting training. L. Muller responded that they use social media and send out e-mails/faxes asking what EMSA wants and needs. They have not contacted EMSA at this point, but are still working to communicate. K. Wagner asked members for approval on this program; all were in agreement that a meeting with the dispatcher representatives and Chiefs Morris, Richwine, and Zagaris to discuss next steps.

C. Cross Generational Marketing
1. No Report

VI. Announcements/Correspondence

A. Master of Science in Homeland Security Degree Program
Presenter: Mike Richwine

Chief Richwine referred to the handout included in the members agenda packets and mentioned the programs being offered across the state for this degree program, and asked that members share this information with their stakeholders.

VII. Roundtable

Mary Jennings discussed the active shooter program, now named Unified Response to Violent Incidents. CFFJAC has started the grant process and the program has evolved.

It is the attempt to help uniform law enforcement and fire operations on incidents that involve violence. CFFJAC has a committee ready to put together a program that will be a train-the-trainer setup and will ask fire and law enforcement to attend together. Registration will be priority for those agencies that send both fire/law enforcement staff. At the end of the program, they will have material, exercises, and a roadmap to go back and put on joint training for fire/law enforcement staff to train together. CFFJAC has tentatively scheduled the first pilot class in Sacramento on April 8, 2014, and will forward more information through e-mail. Signups will take place on CFFJAC website. Chief Richwine stated that there are two similar programs coming later and they also want to get approval to use ODP funds.

Randy Collins stated that he is hiring a full-time instructor for the fire program, and to pass that information on to anyone interested.

Chief Richwine stated that before the February 28, 2014 meeting, members should review the curriculum that will be presented for approval and have questions ready beforehand. Some of the curriculum content will be presented at the February 20 State Board of Fire Services (SBFS) meeting.

The next STEAC meeting on February 28, 2014 is being held at the California Fire & Rescue Training Authority, and maps/directions will be provided.

VIII. Future Meeting Dates

A. February 28, 2014; April 18, 2014; July 18, 2014

IX. Adjournment

A. Meeting was adjourned at 2:50 pm.